EXPURGATED EDITION!

LUCIFER.

THE LIGHT-BEARER.

CENSORED BY THE POSTAL AUTHORITIES BEFORE DELIVERY TO SUBSCRIBERS.
ENTERED AT THE CHICAGO POSTOFFICE AS SECOND-CLASS MAIL MATTER.

PRICE FIVE CENTS. CHICAGO, ILL., NOV. 23, E. M. 305. [C. E. 1905.] WHOLE NO. 1053

THE FENCE OR THE AMBULANCE.

'Twas a dangerous cliff, as they freely confessed,
Though to walk near its crest was so pleasant:
But over its terrible edge there had slipped
A duke and full many a peasant.
So the people said something would have to be done,
But their projects did not at all tally.
Some, "Put a fence around the edge of the cliff,"
Some, "An ambulance down in the valley."

But the cry for the ambulance carried the day,
And it spread through the neighboring city;
A fence may be useful or not, it is true,
But each heart became brimful of pity
For those who slipped over that dangerous cliff.
And the dwellers in highway and alley
Gave pounds or gave pence, not to put up a fence,
But an ambulance down in the valley.

Then an old sage remarked: "It's a marvel to me
That people give far more attention
To repairing results than to stopping the cause,
When they'd better aim at prevention.
Let us stop at its source all this mischief," cried he,
"Come neighbors and friends, let us rally;
If the cliff we will fence, we might almost dispense
With the ambulance down in the valley.

"Oh, he's a fanatic," the others rejoined;
"Dispense with the ambulance? Never!
He'd dispense with all charities, too; if he could.
No, no, we'll support them forever!
Aren't we picking up folks just as fast as they fall?
And shall this man dictate to us? Shall he?
Why should people of sense stop to put up a fence,
While the ambulance works in the valley?"

—JOSEPH MALINS.

Better generate well than reclaim them when old—
For the gist of this matter is seeing
That to rescue the fallen is good, but 'tis best
To hinder such people from being.
Better close up the source that generates crime
Than deliver from dungeon or galley;
Better put a stout fence round the edge of the cliff
Than an ambulance down in the valley.

BERNARD SHAW IN SELF-DEFENSE.

For two months or more, and to an extent almost if not quite unprecedented, the great metropolitan dailies of two hemispheres have given publicity to a controversy over the books and plays of George Bernard Shaw, the distinguishing feature of which books and plays seems to be that they depict human life in the great cities *as it is really lived.*

The fame of another London playwright, one William Shakespeare, rests chiefly on the fact that he painted human life so well that his stage characters seem even more real to us than the women and men of flesh and blood we meet every day.

Is not this the true explanation of the extraordinary prominence lately given to Bernard Shaw, his "Superman" and his "Mrs. Warren's Profession"?

Out of the great mass of "interviews" and "criticisms" given to the sensation-hunting public, in regard to this matter, within the past few weeks I select two articles, one from the Chicago "Record-Herald," and one from the New York "Sun." Lack of space prevents "display" of head-lines to correspond with the original presentation in these dailies, but the essential points of these head-lines are given herewith as printed in the metropolitan dailies:

SHAW IN MARTYR ROLE.

English Playwright Airs Indignation at Suppression of His Drama. Rails at "Comstockery."

Author of "Mrs. Warren" Threatens to Shock New York Censor Out of His Wits.

[Special Cable Dispatch to the *Chicago-Record-Herald.*]
[Copyright, 1905, by New York Herald Company.]

London, Nov. 6.—The *Morning Leader* will publish tomorrow an article by Bernard Shaw in defense of his play, "Mrs. Warren's Profession," in the course of which he says:

"There is no side issue in 'Mrs. Warren's Profession.' There is the direct and inevitable consequence of the relations between parties, which is not shirked, and which, if it were shirked, would leave the play open to the charge of being an advertisement of the advantages of a disreputable life. In the play Mrs. Warren is pictured as sober, greedy, hard working and pursuing her trade with plenty of business ability and consequent commercial success.

BIT OF HISTORY GIVEN.

The interference of American police has an instructive history. Some time ago an unfortunate editor published an article in America in which the marital relations were broadly handled. For this offense against decency he suffered the prompt confiscation of his paper and a severe sentence of imprisonment, and his case was a by no means isolated one.

"He appealed to me to help him draw attention to the infamy of his treatment. I of course could do nothing, but I bided my time, and when the terror established by Anthony Comstock, secretary of rect, but it is a society of persons who call public attention to their own purity and to other people's impurity—when this terror frightened the Manhattan public libraries into placing a restriction on the distribution of my book, I succeeded in compelling them to withdraw the restriction by mentioning the case I have described and adding that Mr. Comstock was making America ridiculous in the eyes of the world.

PUTS BLAME ON COMSTOCK.

"I used the term 'Comstockery' to describe the white terror, and the word struck the fancy of New York. It laughed, and Comstock was furious, declaring that my works were immoral; that he would set the law in motion against me; that he had never heard of me nor read my works, but would now do so in search of something to prosecute me for.

"He has certainly been as good as his word. With the municipal elections at hand and Tammany eager for suffrages of the pure, he has had no difficulty in persuading the commissioner of police to raise the white flag by prosecuting not 'Mrs. Warren' and 'Sir George Crofts,' but my attempt to throw some light into the dark places whence they draw their profits.

"The public has nothing to do with the attack. It supports Comstock generally, because he has destroyed ninety-three tons of post cards in his lifetime as indecent, and it believes that most of the publications he suppresses are noxious rubbish and no good to anyone, but when it comes to imprisoning and ruining men for trying to protect women from reckless conjugal behavior and setting up a censorship of literature, by a private official of obviously limited literary intelligence, whose life has been spent in hunting out obscenities, I have protested, and Comstock has declared his intention of suppressing me. He had better, for if he does not, I am afraid I shall end by shocking him out of his wits."

SHAW PROUD OF HIS PLAY.

Police Not Protecting Public Morality in Suppressing "Mrs. Warren," He Says.

[Special Cable Dispatch to *The Sun.*]

London, Oct. 31.—The correspondent of *The Sun* today interviewed George Bernard Shaw in reference to the suppression by the New York police of his play "Mrs. Warren's Profession." Mr. Shaw said:

"If Police Commissioner McAdoo has earned by his public services the confidence of the American people as a man of higher

character and deeper insight into social needs, moral problems and greater concern for the good of the community than I, it is not for me to question his qualifications or to incite Mr. Daly to resist his authority. I have a certain reputation in the world, which will not be altered by Mr. McAdoo's conviction that I am a blackguard. The New York police have a certain reputation in the world, and that also will not be altered by my conviction. I know my own business better than they do.

"In the opinion of the police prostitution is a permissible subject on the stage only when it is made agreeable. In my opinion the numerous plays in which it is made agreeable should be counterbalanced by plays in which its sordid cause is exposed.

"I am extremely proud of having written the play. It has made me more friends than any other work of mine, especially among serious women. It will make me friends of the same stamp in America, and these friends will keep steadily pressing the two questions: Are the facts exposed in 'Mrs. Warren's Profession' denied? If not, in whose interests are they suppressed?

"It will be seen more and more clearly that the police, doubtless with the best intentions, are protecting not public morality but the interests of the most dangerous class, namely, the employers who pay women less than subsistence wages and overwork them mercilessly to grind profits for themselves out of the pith of the nation. Naturally they raise the clamor of immorality and disgusting dialogue, but in the end the public conscience of America, at present a hasty, unintelligent and easily duped force, will get educated and go over them like a steam roller, with an effective factory code stated by the way.

"Mr. Daly offered to abide by the verdict of the New York press. If this is true, he must have forgotten that the New York press does not go to the theatre. It only sends critics. Let the editors come and the verdict proposed by Mr. Daly will be possible, but if social and moral questions are left to the critics they will not improve on Mr. McAdoo, who probably knows the real world much better than they. For my own part, I would prefer a jury of public spirited women with experience in rescue work and slum life to any other jury whatever. They know how society makes vice by refusing to pay virtue decently."

From these clippings it would appear that Mr. Shaw's offense is substantially the same as that of LUCIFER'S editor—for which offense said editor is now a prisoner under sentence of one year at hard labor in the Illinois penitentiary. This offense is neither more nor less than TELLING TOO MUCH TRUTH to suit the ears and the eyes of the censors of morals in this country and in England. Hence it is not strange that Bernard Shaw should express a sympathetic interest, a fraternal interest, in the case of an "unfortunate editor who published an article in America in which the marital relations were broadly handled," and for which offense "he suffered the prompt confiscation of his paper and a severe sentence of imprisonment." While it is not quite correct, by the way, to say that I "appealed" to Mr. Shaw to "help call attention to the infamy of the treatment" I was, and still am, receiving, it is true that one or more of LUCIFER'S friends on this side the Atlantic did call Mr. Shaw's attention to this outrage and asked him to lend the power of his pen to help get the facts of this Chicago persecution before liverty-lovers everywhere who read and speak the English language.

LUCIFER'S friends and helpers, as well as its editor, owe a debt of gratitude to Bernard Shaw for what he has done and is doing to help onward the work of creating a public sentiment, a public conscience, that will soon demand the repeal, or the *ignoring*, of the medieval laws that now enable such men as Anthony Comstock to hold up and hold back the car of human progress by making it dangerous for all who would tell the truth, the whole truth, about the "marital relations," the conventional, the "sacramental" marriage system, now enforced in all lands called Christian.

Much more I would like to say in comment upon these noble utterances of Bernard Shaw, but for lack of space will close by saying that the last few lines quoted from him deserve special attention and consideration. *Whose fault is it* that Mr. Shaw cannot have a "jury of public-spirited women" to decide the question as to whether his plays should be enacted before a mixed audience of women, men and children?

Is it not the fault of women themselves?

If women should do as men have done, not wait to have somebody to *grant* them political or civil rights, but proceed to *take* them —if they would say to their husbands, fathers, brothers and sons,

"No more children!—no more 'marital rights,' till woman's political and civil *equality* with man is recognized and practicalized" —if women in general, or if only a respectable *minority* of women were seriously to take this stand, how long, think you, would Bernard Shaw be compelled to plead in vain for a "jury of women" to decide upon the morality or immorality of his plays? M. HARMAN.

Marriage is the only legal contract which abrogates as between the parties all the laws that safeguard the particular relation to which it refers.—G. B. Shaw.

DESPOTISM MADE POSSIBLE THROUGH "FRAUD ORDER."

Very few people in the country are aware of the fact that on September 19, 1890, the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in congress assembled enacted a law (under pretense of revising certain statutes relating to lotteries) which makes it possible for the postmaster general to deprive any person of his or her right to the use of the United States mails, regardless of the fact that they have in no way been guilty of fraud or other violation of the law, and that they have complied with all known postal regulations.

Those who do know of the existence of this law are not all offenders against it, as might generally be supposed. There are many instances known to the writer where letters of a purely personal nature have been withheld from the person to whom they were addressed, simply because that person had been accused of fraudulent use of the mails, although the accusation was not substantiated by the facts in the case, and the person accused was not in prison or even "out on bail."

In the case of Helen Wilmans-Post, of Seabreeze, Florida, the postoffice authorities withheld her mail from her for more than two years while they vainly tried to find any of her patients—whom she had treated according to the methods of mental scientists—who would testify that they had been in any way defrauded by her. Had they found such a patient, one who would have offered such testimany, the United States government would have used it against Mrs. Post, but at the same time they refused to permit her to introduce the testimony of any one of the thousands of patients whom she had benefitted by her advice and treatment, although any number of them volunteered to give their testimony in her defense.

Such injustice and such outrage upon the rights of any individual should have brought forth a vigorous protest from every fair-minded person in the country. That it did not do so may be attributed to the fact that the daily papers and the magazines, either through indifference or ignorance of the real facts in the case, maintained absolute silence, and the general public were therefore uninformed.

The writer of this article was ignorant of the significance and far-reaching power of the law above referred to until in July, 1903, having occasion to address a personal letter to Mrs. Post, editor of "Freedom," Seabreeze, Fla., she was surprised a few days later to have her letter returned to her marked "Fraudulent," and further inscribed "Return to writer."

Knowing that my letter was not fraudulent in itself, and did not relate in any way to any fraudulent business, and also that I had complied with all postal regulations, I enclosed the letter to Mrs. Post in another envelope addressed to the postmaster at Seabreeze, Fla., with a written demand for its delivery to the person to whom it was addressed. It was again returned to me with the statement that the P. M. was acting under instructions from Washington and could consider no others. I then addressed a letter to President Roosevelt stating all the facts in the case, and one also to the postmaster general, asking by what authority my rights as a citizen of this country were so interfered with. The answer came back that the postmaster general acted in accordance with the power conferred upon him by the United States congress.

I then sent for a copy of the law which conferred such extraordinary power upon the head of the postal department, and while the text of it is too long to give in its entirety I will quote one section from it in order that readers of LUCIFER may know that so long as that law remains upon the statute books we may expect nothing but injustice and abuse from the postal officials either at Washington or elsewhere. If any one desires the full text of this bill they can receive the same by sending a request for a copy to C. H. Robb, assistant attorney general for the Postoffice Department at Washington.

The bill is entitled "United States statutes having reference to the transmission through the mails of matter relating to lotteries, schemes to defraud, and schemes or devices for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations or promises."

"An Act to amend certain sections of the Revised Statutes relating to lotteries, *and for other purposes.* (Act of September 19, 1890.)

"Sec. 2. That section thirty-nine hundred and twenty-nine of the Revised Statutes be, and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3929. The postmaster general may upon evidence satisfactory to him that any person or company is engaged in conducting any lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme for the distribution of money or of any real or personal property by lot, chance, or drawing of any kind, or that any person or company is conducting any other scheme or device for obtaining money or property of any kind through the mails by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations or promises, instruct postmasters at any postoffice at which registered letters arrive directed to any such person or company, or to the agent or representative of any such person or company, whether such agent or representative is acting as an individual or as a firm, bank, corporation, or association of any kind, to return all such registered letters to the postmaster at the office at which they were originally mailed, with the word "Fraudulent" plainly written or stamped upon the outside thereof, and all such letters so returned to such postmasters shall be by them returned to the writers thereof, under such regulations as the postmaster general may prescribe. But nothing contained in this section shall be so construed as to authorize any postmaster or other person to open any letter not addressed to himself.

The public advertisement by such person or company so conduct-

3003B1
de 21 43

ing such lottery, gift enterprise, scheme, or device, that remittances for the same may be made by registered letters to any other person, firm, bank, corporation or association named therein shall be held to be prima facie evidence of the existence of such agency by all the parties named therein; but the postmaster general shall not be precluded from ascertaining the existence of such agency in any other legal way satisfactory to himself."

There are two things which cannot fail to impress the thinking mind as the full significance of this law is comprehended. The first, is the unlimited authority it places at the disposal of the postmaster general, and the second is the omission of any clause relating to the reimbursement of the people for the money paid in postage, accepted by the government for the delivery of mail matter which it afterwards refuses to deliver to the person to whom it is addressed. It is surely a strange omission that some such provision was not made, since by not doing so, our legislators have placed the United States government in the peculiar position of "obtaining money under false or fraudulent pretenses, representations or promises."

It is worse even than that, for whatever may be said of the individuals who offer inducements to simple minded people to voluntarily part with their money for gold bricks, lottery tickets, real estate, mining stock, masses for the dead or any other scheme of that nature, what shall we say when our government engages in the "hold-up" business in the manner we have described, for even if the postoffice authorities return our letters, they have performed an act that can only be likened to the 'hold-up" man who returns our pocketbook after relieving us of the money there was in it.

Meeting with so little serious objection or protest from the people in the pursuit of this game, what could we expect but that they would go still further and confiscate and destroy the property of citizens as they have confiscated and destroyed so many editions of LUCIFER that the subscribers have paid for, and the editor has prepaid postage upon? Do we ask for redress? There is "no provision" for such, so I am informed by the assistant attorney general of whom I made inquiry.

Well, it is LUCIFER now, but what paper or magazine will be the next to come under the ban remains to be seen. That this despotic law will be used to cripple and destroy others than LUCIFER is not to be doubted for an instant, and we cannot help propounding the question,—Will it be easier to have this atrocious law repealed now in its infancy, or later, after it has become such a power in the hands of despotic officials that it can crush the life out of any paper or magazine whose principles are not in accord with the LACK OF PRINCIPLE in the minds of these same officials?

These are the things we are now to consider seriously, and if the editors of all papers would unite and make LUCIFER'S cause the cause of all, the fight for the freedom of the press would be won in America for all time.

Let us all work to this end.

HULDA L. POTTER-LOOMIS.

168 Thirty-first Street, Chicago.

THE SOCIAL COMRADESHIP OF MEN AND WOMEN.

The social side of the interdependence of men and women, the mutual help and comfort, is placed last in the church statement of the aims to be attained. But, without any unnecessary discussion of relative importance, it is natural to consider first this social activity of sex because it precedes the others in the lives of all. Beginning with conscious social life, it lasts the whole length of it, and is noticeable in the lives of all the higher animals, in some of whom it is more conspicuous than in man. The high principle of love of our kind is always involved in the best friendships; and where the social ideal is felt as higher than the purely sexual ideal, the love is more intense, and the poet stated a deep truth when he said, "I could not love thee, dear, so much, loved I not honour more." For the happiness of each as well as all, we must have moral principles—that is, social principles—to which friendship is subservient, however hard Comstock and all his may work to keep from us the knowledge which is the only true ground-work of morality, and to thrust us back into the moral chaos from which society has already suffered so much.

In healthy lives, personal attractions and comradeships come early in youth, and should lay a good foundation in the character for the best love alliances of later life. They seem deep rooted in social instinct, and may be observed even in such comparatively little social animals as cats, among whom the young male especially links himself with an older male companion, and doubtless benefits by association in hunting and in cat proficiency generally.

The pair friendships of youth certainly have a sexual element in them, intensifying as they do at puberty; and, as Emerson says of the attraction of opposite and complementary natures, "sex is not local but universal." These friendships have a refining influence; and only the perversity and vulgarity of puritan minds attribute injurious and coarse expression to these intimacies.

The same beneficent impulse is vaguely recognized in the word chivalry. This is usually referred only to the kindness of men towards women, whereas it is more often exercised in everyday life by women towards men, in whom it seems to blend with maternal feeling. The chivalry of women towards men is perhaps less frequently noticed because it is more usual.

Social comradeship is the main factor in the success of any permanent sexual partnership, and it has often served to shield the failures in other respects of marriage. It is deplorable, however, that often the best conditions of this friendship are neglected when the irrevocable alliance is being contemplated. A difference between the religious or philosophic beliefs of the pair is actually supposed to be a trifling matter. Yet to those who know what a strong bond of feeling mutual aspirations and beliefs held in common may be, divergence of opinion on large subjects seems a great drawback in any friendship.

And where friendship fails within marriage, it is scarcely to be found outside of it, in puritan society; for the married usually give up all old friendships besides, and their mating is a game of chance to win one friendship or none.

There is a belief still prevalent that any social enjoyment is somewhat wrong for a woman. This was shown in a recent discussion on race "suicide," when an English bishop contributed the suggestion that the selfishness of women in indulging in cycling, horseback riding and hockey was a cause of decrease in the birth rate,—without, of course, adducing any evidence that these physical exercises have actually proved detrimental to maternity. "It is selfishness on her part," he said. "She has a stupid notion that she must be her husband's chum. She cannot be in the sense that she can go in for the same exercise." The bishop's remarks are an example of the lack of wisdom that always accompanies lack of sympathy.

In past ages, it was certainly advantageous to society that the women should be kept strictly to their duty of that time to bear as many children as possible, while the men had to be ready for the violent exercises of hunting and warfare; and men of the savage period no doubt took advantage of the situation to make women do nearly all the rest of the labor. But modern developments have changed all this in advanced countries. In rational lives of love and labor, of both men and women, companionship in moderate muscular exercise, whether in work or play, presents no difficulty, and need only be modified for a few brief periods in the lives of women.

The social rule that there should be no social intimacy between the sexes unless marriage is contemplated is one of the most obvious ways in which the marriage system lowers the moral tone of society. Those who in any way set aside the rule are liable to have their motives misunderstood in a most annoying way; and a young man may even be entrapped by a mercenary parent suddenly demanding "What are your intentions?" The result is that the more refined and honorable often submit to social isolation from the opposite sex.

The greatest of all drawbacks to the happy comradeship of men and women has been the difference in their intellectual and moral education. This unfortunate system of different upbringing is, we may hope, passing away; and a happier generation—and why should it not be the next generation?—of men and women will be taught that next to their duty to society generally as faithful citizens comes the duty of each sex to minister to the highest happiness of the other.

FIDEI DEFENSOR.

HAS AMERICA THE BEST MARRIAGE LAWS?

In No. 1051 W. H. Breese says: "I admit there is plenty to improve in our present legal marriage code, still it is the best the race has so far developed." What constitutes a good marriage code, if such a thing there be, is a matter of opinion, but Mr. Breese approves of "women's equality and freedom," so I presume he would test a marriage code by that standard. Let us apply his test to the facts.

The following is from Kent's "Commentaries on American Law," edition of 1884, Vol. 2, page 181: "As the husband is the guardian of the wife, and bound to protect and maintain her, the law has given him a reasonable superiority and control over her person, and he may even put gentle restraints upon her liberty, if her conduct be such as to require it. * * * If he shifts his domicile, the wife is bound to follow him wherever he chooses to go." I believe there is no doubt that this passage states the law as it stands today in almost, if not quite, every state of the union.

In England a wife can go and live wherever she likes, and the husband has no say in the matter; neither has he the smallest control over her movements. In the case of the Queen versus Jackson, 1891, Lord Escher, who was then considered the ablest judge on the English bench, said: "Under the law of England a man has no more rights over the personal liberty of his wife than over that of any other woman." There is still some doubt as to whether a man has any rights over his wife while she remains voluntarily under his roof, but there is not the slightest doubt that by walking out of the door she can deprive him of all claim to interfere with her.

In some American states the law on the guardianship of children is very advanced, but these are chiefly in the far west. In many of the more populous states the law on this subject is still medieval. From a recent newspaper report I understand that even now a New York woman whose husband is dead has no right to her children if the husband has appointed some other guardian by will. In France for many years a widow has had an absolute right to the custody and control of her children, and all that the husband can do is to appoint an adviser to act with her. In England a similar law has lately been passed.

The paragraph occupying this space in the first edition of this number was declared by the postal censorship to be unmailable.

There is one sure way in which any one with a talent for languages can make a fortune. Let him travel over Europe lecturing on the marriage laws of the United States. He would have to be quick, however, for so many people would die of laughing that laws would everywhere be passed to prohibit further allusion to the subject.

R. B. KERR.

LUCIFER.

THE LIGHT-BEARER.

MOSES HARMAN, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED FORTNIGHTLY AT 500 FULTON ST., CHICAGO, ILL.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

One year.....$1.00 Three months .....25 cents
Six months.....50 cents Single copies..... 5 cents

Hereafter Lucifer will not be sent to subscribers after expiration of subscription except by special request. Please compare number on your wrapper with whole number of paper, and if your subscription is about to expire notify us if you wish to continue to receive Lucifer.

EASTERN REPRESENTATIVE:
E. C. WALKER, 244 WEST 143D STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

LUCIFER: ITS MEANING AND PURPOSE.

LUCIFER—The planet Venus; so called from its brightness.—Webster's Dictionary.

LUCIFEROUS—Giving light; affording light or the means of discovery.—Same.

LUCIFIC—Producing light.—Same.

LUCIFORM—Having the form of light.—Same.

The name Lucifer means Light-Bringing or Light-Bearing, and the paper that has adopted this name stands for Light against Darkness—for Reason against Superstition—for Science against Tradition—for Investigation and Enlightenment against Credulity and Ignorance—for Liberty against Slavery—for Justice against Privilege.

CONGRESS SHALL MAKE NO LAW RESPECTING AN ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION, OR PROHIBITING THE FREE EXERCISE THEREOF; OR ABRIDGING THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH, OR OF THE PRESS; OR THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE PEACEABLY TO ASSEMBLE, AND TO PETITION THE GOVERNMENT FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES.—*First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.*

CITIZEN OR SUBJECT—WHICH?

Two articles have been written for this issue of LUCIFER by special request of the editor. To these two articles the careful attention of everyone claiming to be an American citizen, or hoping to become such, is hereby earnestly called.

The first and longer of these articles, that of Hulda L. Potter-Loomis, is written by one who has given more attention than most readers have done, to the comparatively recent encroachments upon the rights of the citizen under the specious plea of protecting the weak and easily-imposed-upon, from the wiles of "confidence" swindlers, lottery-ticket vendors, etc., etc.

In other words, the article was written to show how the postal department of the United States government is now being used to discriminate against and crush the business of those who happen to fall under the displeasure of powerful "vested" interests, such as the "medical" monopoly. The case of Mrs. Wilmans-Post is cited as an example, chiefly because Mrs. Loomis happens to be in possession of some of the facts relating to this outrage, not because there is anything particularly outrageous connected with it. Many other instances involving much greater hardship and suffering than the Wilmans case could be cited showing the working of this the latest, perhaps, of the federal enactments whose purpose seems to be to deprive the citizen of the right to manage his own business in his own way so long as he does not invade the equal right of his neighbor.

The other article to which attention is specially called is one that more nearly concerns the life and work of the publication called LUCIFER—"Son of the Morning." For some weeks, if not months, a number of our friends, notably members of the Free Speech League, have insisted that an action at law should be entered at once to *compel* the postmaster at Chicago to admit the current editions of LUCIFER to its equitable share of the United States mail service; also to restrain the postal department at Washington, D. C., from *confiscating* and *destroying* such editions of the paper as may fall under the condemnation of the censors.

Having consulted three very reputable legal firms of this city and having received substantially the same answer from all, in regard to what could and what could not be done, I asked Mr. Soelke to write out the opinion of his firm and give it to me for publication. Here is his answer:

STEDMAN & SOELKE, COUNSELLORS AT LAW, 94 LA SALLE STREET.
CHICAGO, Nov. 18, 1905.

MOSES HARMAN, Esq., 500 Fulton Street, City.

DEAR SIR: In the administration by the Postoffice Department of the postal law relating to so-called "obscene" matter, the said Department claims and exercises the right of determining what is and what is not "obscene" and to act directly against such matter by denying it the use of the mails, and, in some instances, by its confiscation and destruction without notice or a hearing before such order is issued.

This law, you claim, is unconstitutional for the following among other reasons:

1. Because it deprives the citizen of his property and liberty without due process of law.

2. Because it abridges the freedom of the press, in violation of the Constitution of the United States.

3. Because it confers judicial power on the officials of the post department.

4. Because by the action of that officer, the citizen would be deprived of his property without due process of law.

The Supreme Court of the United States has answered these contentions in the negative.

I am requested by you now to make a terse statement of the reasons advanced by the Supreme Court in support of their decisions. They are as follows, as I understand:

The power conferred on the Postoffice Department by the statute in question is not judicial in its strict sense, but merely involves the exercise of discretion and judgment and where the law authorizes an officer to exercise judgment and discretion, the courts will not entertain an appeal from the decision of such officer, nor revise his judgment in any such case. Nor can it my mandamus act directly upon the officer and guide and control his judgment or discretion in matters committed to his care in the discharge of his official duties.

The principal reason urged for this by said court is that under any other rule government would be administered not by the great departments ordained by the Constitution and laws guided by the modes therein described, but by the uncertain and perhaps contradictory action of the courts in the enforcement of their views of private interests. Hence, the court says, the only acts to which the power of the courts by mandamus extends are such as are purely ministerial and with regard to which nothing like judgment and discretion in the performance of his duties is left to the officer, but whenever the right of judgment or discretion exists in him, it is he and not the courts who can regulate its exercise. And with respect to the exercise of this discretion by the head of an executive department, it has even been held that he cannot be held liable to a civil suit for damages on account of his official acts in respect to matters within his authority by reason of any personal or even malicious motive that might be alleged to have prompted him; that it would seriously cripple the proper and effective administration of public affairs as intrusted to the executive branch of the government if he were subjected to any such restraint.

The only relief, then, for the abuse of this discretion, appears to be impeachment or indictment for malfeasance and, on conviction, removal from office of the offender.

In one case that I recall, the court said substantially that a citizen of the United States has no absolute constitutional right that his mail shall be carried by the United States at all, that whatever rights he may have in this respect exist in the discretion of the legislature and are entirely different from those fundamental rights to life, liberty and property which are secured by the Constitution, and that since then Congress may or may not, in its discretion, provide a postal system for public convenience, it is difficult to say what condition it may not impose to its use and enjoyment. Of course, Congress, in the exercise of its discretionary powers, cannot discriminate between persons or classes of persons, but the court holds that persons and property can be subjected to all kinds of restraint and burdens in order to secure the general comfort, and the right of every citizen to the benefit of the discretionary legislation of Congress must, therefore, be subject to the necessity of public health, morals and order and the general welfare, and the efficient execution of the powers expressly conferred by the constitution. The discretionary power conferred by law upon the postoffice department does not, according to said court, make this action tantamount to a trial, and penal judgment against the party affected by it; its effect is not to punish but to preserve the mails from misuse. Very truly yours,

CHAS. H. SOELKE.

Instead of giving my own views now upon the several points presented in this carefully prepared legal opinion I prefer to wait a fortnight, meantime asking every one who believes in the legend known as "equal rights for all and special privileges for none," to read and re-read, consider and reconsider the words of Mr. Soelke. Especially do I ask all who happen to possess matured opinions upon the question as to what the word *citizenship* in the United States really means, to write out, as briefly, as clearly, as possible her or his opinion—either for publication in LUCIFER or in some other paper, or simply for comparison of ideas—and send the same to this office. But few of such articles can be published in LUCIFER, but the *preparation* of the same will be worth all it costs in time and trouble.

Whether the opinion of Mr. Soelke is to be reprinted or not it will be well for each reader who feels interested in the question of citizenship on the one hand and serfdom on the other to keep this copy of LUCIFER for reference.

M. HARMAN.

OUR BRITISH EXCHANGES.

Among the foreign exchanges that come to Lucifer's office none deserve more grateful and more appreciative mention than does "The Truth Seeker," published at Bradford, England. While not always in full accord with the methods of its editor, I regard him as one of the most valiant champions of freedom of speech and of press now living. At the head of his title page stands the words "Prosecuted for Blasphemy," from which legend we understand that he has himself been the victim of the unholy alliance known as church and state. For the past year the Bradford "Truth Seeker" has been published quarterly only, but it is now announced that, commencing January, 1906, it will be published monthly. It is offered at the very low price of one shilling six pence per annum, post paid to any address. Prominent among the articles in this current number is "The Mission of Spiritualism," by Mrs. L. A. Griffin; "Balmy Believers," by Ernest Pack; "The Bible Against Itself," by J. D. Shaw; "Egos Vivisected While You Wait," by Malfew Seklew. Under the head of "Books Received" we find notices of two pamphlets published at 500 Fulton street, Chicago, as follows:

"Social Freedom, by Hulda L. Potter Loomis. The author states that she sends forth her message into the great sad world like 'the dove' sent from 'the ark,' bearing its 'olive branch' of Peace and Love, hoping that when 'the great flood' of strife, hatred and turmoil, engendered in the heart of humanity by ages of false teaching, has subsided a little it may find a resting place, and be the means of helping to create a better understanding of our human relations in the minds of men and women.

The sentence occupying this space in the first edition of this number was declared by the postal censorship to be unmailable.

The book is published by Moses Harman, price 1-6, and sold by Truth Seeker Co., 2 Union street, Bradford.

"Sex Radicalism: As Seen by an Emancipated Woman of the New Time. By Dora Forster. The mistake of Christendom, above all other mistakes, is its failure to give a rational education to children in regard to sex. And growing out of this fundamental mistake the crime of Christendom, above all its other crimes, is its treatment of womanhood and motherhood in the sex-relation. Out of this mistake of mistakes, out of this crime of crimes, more than from any other cause or causes, have grown up the inequalities, the despotisms, the slaveries that now curse all the nations of the world calling themselves Christians. It is with the hope of adding a little to the fund of knowledge of sex—which 'lies at the root of life'—that the book, Sex Radicalism, has been written."—From the preface.]

"The sale of this book has been stopped in America, and our old and esteemed friend Moses Harman has been sentenced to one year's imprisonment for sending it through the mails. He is appealing to a higher court, and at the second trial it is hoped he will receive the common justice which has been denied him at the first trial. The boasted freedom of America seems to have evolved into all boast and no freedom. Anyway, we recommend the book, and we sell it, the price is 2-6 post free. Orders to J. W. Gott, 10 St. James' Hall, Manchester."

A word of explanation just here: Brother Gott is quite correct in saying that Lucifer's editor is now under sentence of one year in state prison, and that he is "appealing to a higher court," but the alleged cause of the prosecution and sentence is not the publication of the booklet called "Sex Radicalism." A chapter of that booklet was pointed out by the prosecutor as one of the causes of complaint, but when the said editor was put upon trial in the Federal court in Chicago, the Forster article seems to have been withdrawn and another, called "The Fatherhood Question," substituted in its place.

For more than a year past the Bradford "Truth Seeker" has been supplied from this office to our readers at 5 cents per copy or yearly at 35 cents. We have now a good stock on hand of the closing number for this current year, also of two earlier issues, which will be sent on application while the supply lasts.

Another of our British exchanges is the London "Freethinker," edited by G. W. Foote. The Freethinker is a sixteen page weekly magazine, price two pence each number, or ten shillings six pence per annum. It is very ably edited; now in its twenty-sixth volume; well printed on superior paper. The leading editorial in the number for October 8 is entitled "Voltaire and the Venus of Milo." Mr. Foote attended the late "International Congress of Freethinkers" at Paris, hence it was natural that he should want to visit the house in which Voltaire—that grand old pioneer of modern Freethought—passed away, on the thirtieth of May, 1778, in the eighty-fourth year of his age. Alluding to Voltaire's great age, Mr. Foote has this to say:

"That he lived so long is a disproof of all the pious stories about his profligate life. He was so delicate in childhood that he was not expected to live to be a man. His lasting for more than four-fifths of a century shows how carefully he must have preserved his strength. And this reflection is strengthened by the knowledge we possess of his laborious and indefatigable career. He was one of those who might wear out but never rust out. He was ever a worker. Probably he filled more pages than any other writer in the world, yet every page is valuable, and is always more or less illuminated by his sleepless wit. How could such a man have dissipated his energy in disorderly living? Everyone with a grain of sense and candor will know how to answer this question."

Speaking of the statue known as the "Venus of Milo," the pride of the Louvre—one of the greatest of all collections of art treasures, the editor adds:

"Hundrds of years before the Christian era some unknown great artist chiseled that wonderful figure. Our Lady of Beauty, the goddess of the best and highest as well as the deepest in man, still stands there as Heine saw her, in nude perfection. Ravishing loveliness rounds every limb and each delightful breast, and quivers on the tender lips and exquisite chin; but divine chastity sits upon the noble brows, and subdues desire into reverence. Here is the eternal feminine that, as Goethe said, has led man on. And this beautiful and splendid dream in marble gladdened men's eyes, and thrilled men's hearts, and inspired men's minds, hundreds of years before Christ, a thousand years before the advent of the Madonna."

Judging from Editor Foote's description of "The Venus of Milo," there would be little chance, if transferred to New York city, that it would be allowed an undraped public exhibition.

Other British exchanges will perhaps receive brief notice in the near future. M. H.

LETTERS TO THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

A few more of the many samples of letters sent by our subscribers to the head servant of the people of the United States:

Theo. Roosevelt, President U. S. A.—Dear Sir: I subscribe for a paper named LUCIFER THE LIGHT BEARER, *published at Chicago, Ill.* In the last six months I have missed five papers, stopped by the postmaster at Chicago. I pay for the paper in advance. When it is deposited in the postoffice and the postage paid it becomes my property. Now, I would like to know what right the postmaster has to confiscate my property. Your attention to the above would greatly oblige, Yours, S. ROSER, Maysville, Ky.

Theodore Roosevelt.—Fellow Citizen: Owing to the fact that the old king-power was vested in the presidential chair to a large extent when our political government was formed, during the famous "secret session," when Uncle Sam was born of the unholy union of Johnny Bull and the spirit of the Spanish Inquisition (the orthodox church), I, a disfranchised citizen, who under a just government would have equal rights of franchise with the masculine powers, am asked to add my voice to a chorus of voices in prayer to you not to imprison Moses Harman, an old gentleman, philanthropist and scientist, of 500 Fulton street, Chicago, for certain work along a scientific line in which I am deeply interested.

This man has been one of the finest assistants to me in the study of divinity, or the love-life, which will rule society when science is relieved from persecution by CRAFTS (the unholy twins before named). I do not wish him again imprisoned for teaching the science that I am going to teach the rest of my life, to men, women and children, and—all lovers of health, life and happiness.

Under separate cover I am sending to you another personal letter, called "Aunt Helen's Love Letter to Deviltry."

Neither the letter nor this can rightly be called a prayer. In both I simply WARN you that if you wish to insure the breaking of the lines of deviltry IN A HURRY, why, take no note of these various appeals to interfere in the case of Moses Harman.

Woman has prayed while man has preyed, quite long enough. She sees now how she can be in a position to COMMAND.

I close with a repetition of the warning: Let the proceedings go on, and you will HASTEN THE FEMININE REBELLION.

Yours very truly, HELEN HOWARD PHILBRICK,
Forsythe, Montana.

Dear President Roosevelt: I must direct your attention to the flagrant absurdity, not to speak of the unconstitutionality of the action of the postoffice authorities, in holding up copies of LUCIFER, a paper issued by Mr. Moses Harman, of Chicago. Mr. Harman himself has been indicted for publishing "obscene" matter. The legal adviser to the postoffice has laid down that all discussion of the relations of the sexes is "obscene." In that case your own letters and utterances respecting "race suicide" are "obscene."

I may remind you that the first amendment to the constitution of the United States enacts that "Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech or of the press." By what legal right, then, is Mr. Harman prosecuted? and why are copies of his paper suppressed? Is this not a revival of the "star chamber" in America? Are you as president of this Republic and as an

American citizen going to let this pass without rebuke? I hope not. Yours respectfully, D. W. HARRIGAN,
St. Louis, Mo., General Delivery.

Theodore Roosevelt.—Dear Sir: Being a subscriber of LUCIFER, a fortnightly paper published by Moses Harman at 500 Fulton street, Chicago, and having during the last few months failed to receive several of the numbers, for which I have paid, on account of certain irregular and high handed actions of the postal authorities, I wish to call your attention to said irregularities. These actions of the postal authorities may be legal, and if they are, it is evident that certain laws must be amended or abolished, but it is certain that they are in opposition to the progress and civilization of our age and against the best of American traditions. When you shall know that Mr. Harman and all the subscribers of LUCIFER have been deprived of their property without such forms and processes as are ordinarily thrown round the rights of our citizens in order to safeguard them against malevolent or arbitrary interference by officials or others, then I am sure you will feel as indignant over it as I do.

Hoping that it is only necessary to call your attention to this matter to get the depredations on our mail stopped and an adequate restitution made to Mr. Harman financially and otherwise, I am,
Very sincerely yours, A. E. ELLIS,
Mechanical and Electrical Engineer, Boston, Mass.

[First printed in the "Demonstrator," Lake Bay, Wash.]

No. 711 Mills Building, San Francisco, Cal., Monday, October 23, 1905.—To the President—Sir: I protest against the holdup of LUCIFER of October 12, 1905. This makes the fifth practical confiscation of my paper in five months. I cannot believe that your censor has stopped this last issue on account of the sensible articles on the all-important sex question. Surely the censor, if this was the reason, must think that we are still in the nursery; if he takes this view the nursery, with its pap, etc., is undoubtedly the right place for him. This issue has probably been suppressed, as far as you can, because of its exposure of the postoffice department, the "graft" of the rent of mail cars, etc. This mail-car business, and not the female question, is my solution of this Russianism. You are traveling the old Roman road at a great pace.

Bernard Shaw's letter in this issue, perhaps, also hurt the pride of Comstock. Shaw is so matter of fact as to the kind of freedom that is screeched by the American eagle—same governmental symbol as the Roman and Russian—a bird of prey.

J. A. KINGHORN JONES,
The father of ten very live children.

LUCIFER'S HELPERS.

In this list are included the names of those who send money or stamps to pay for LUCIFER or its pamphlets to be sent to friends who are not now subscribers; also the names of those who contribute to the fund for legal defense in the courts, and to keep LUCIFER'S flag afloat while prosecuted for alleged "obscenity." If any names have been omitted that should have been included in this list, or, if included, incorrectly credited, the error will be gladly corrected when our attention is called thereto.

Some have sent money direct to the treasurer of the Free Speech League, Dr. E. B. Foote, Jr., 120 Lexington avenue, New York, from whom we have not yet had a full report. Others have sent a few stamps, five or ten cents at a time, of which no account is taken in these public credits.

A. Steinhauser, 20c; Frank Victoria, 16c; Theodore Debs, 50c; F. W. Heintz, 16c; H. C. Hanson, $2; J. W. Grigg, $5; Ernest Winn, $1; Anna Stirling, $1; J. E. Collins, 10c; H. W. Boozer, 20c; F. J. Van Voorhis, $1; J. Al. Wilson, 50c; Florencio Bassora, $1; M. H. Taft, $1; Anna B. Fish, 25c; Harold L. Wood, 50c; C. S. Haney, $1; Martin Braden, $1; H. D. Christoph, $2; Mrs. M. McCaslin, 16c; William B. Du Bois, $4; George Brayton, 25c; J. B. Billard, $1; J. L. Buxton, $1.75; Virna Walker, 25c; O. E. Laurence, $1; A. G. Lengberg, 50c; G. E. Littlefield, 50c; Andrew Peterson, 50c; A. Friend, California, $1; J. S. Hughes, $1; A. Kupperman, 50c; Robert D. Irwin, 10c; T. H. Houghton, 25c; Henry Cowell, 12c; Emma Boyer, 25c; J. L. H., 25c; O. B. S., Philadelphia, $1; J. W. Kelley, $5; Ella Kautz, 18c; G. W. G. Wright, 50c; W. P. Austin, 10c; T. F. Lee, 50c; C. C. Fairchild, $1; M. Kislink, $1; T. Schroeder, 40c; David Hoyle, $1; Helen Philbrick, $1; T. Theo. Colwick, 50c; E. Breese, 12c; James H. Barry, $5; Electa Dodd, 25c; O. M. La Barre, 25c; E. Bordwell, 10c; D. D. Thompson, $1.24; H. A. Libbey, $1; Susan Reicherter, 10c; W. P. Ward, 12c; W. G. Scott, $1; James Wicklund, 25c; G. W. Carpenter, 50c; Annie E. Cummings, 15c; John R. Nigh, 25c; T. F. Meade, 25c; John Cairns, $1; J. O. Charbonneau, $1; M. L. Studebaker, $1; C. T. Sprading, $1; A. F. Hill, 10c; James F. Clark, $1; Ed. Secrest, $1; H. H. Cady, $1; Mattie Shepherd, $1; Perle McLeod, 50c; H. W. Hunt, 20c; Max Kahn, 25c; O. A. Veritz, $1; W. A. Whinrey, $1; Frank Tascano, 12c; Friends at St. Madeline Village, Trinidad, West Indies, $1; Albina L. Washburn, $1.14; C. H. Henn, $2; S. P. Boyer, 30c; Maggie Dimmick, $1; August Gatel, 50c; E. L. Small, 20c; A. W. Frankenberg, $4; E. Holum, $1.14; Mrs. H. W. Woodard, $1; J. Nielson, $1; Mrs. S. Harding, 15c; John Crerar Library, 40c; B. Vale, $1; Annie B. Fish, 25c; M. T. Braatelin, 25c; J. H. Lohmeyer, $1; J. K. Martin, 50c; Richard Davorkosen, 25c; Helda Lindstrom, 50c; J. E. Witman, $2.35; Thirza Rathbun, 25c; L. A. Ueland, $1; A. Thomas, 25c; Rosa F. Larson, 25c; Paul Robin (and friends in France), $1.30.

BERNARR M'FADDEN ARRESTED.

"Physical Culture" for November contains this notice of the arrest of its editor:

"Mr. Anthony Comstock, prize prude of the country, secured a warrant for the arrest of the editor of this magazine because of the latter's connection with the putting out of posters advertising the recent Physical Culture Exhibition. Two magistrates to whom Comstock applied for a warrant absolutely refused to listen to him, and it was only after the third attempt that he was successful.

"We have watched Mr. Comstock's work in numerous instances, and though in some rare cases he might have been commended, yet on the majority of occasions he was seriously or ludicrously at fault.

"His attitude toward the human body shows very clearly the condition of his mind. To him a beautiful statue of marble or a perfectly formed body of flesh—the crowning effort of the Creator—has all the vulgar and nasty attributes that the human mind can possibly conceive. We sincerely pity him for his unhappy perversion of taste and instinct. From the standpoint of the physical culturist he is a monstrosity and has no place in an era when the beauty and nobility and holiness of the human body are beginning to be recognized by the world at large.

"The arrest of the editor of this magazine occurred just as we were going to press, but our next issue will contain full details of the outrage.

"In the meantime, we would suggest to Mr. Comstock that he secure a Supreme Court injunction against the Almighty to prevent the latter from permitting children to be born without clothing."

Brother McFadden is learning by dear experience that no man can safely be trusted with powers such as Anthony Comstock exercises over his fellow human beings. The "cases" in which Comstock "might have been commended" only serve to show how easily such powers could be perverted to improper uses. Now that McFadden himself is the victim he will probably be prepared to join with others in the demand that the office of censor of press, of mails, of literature and of art, be entirely abolished, as survivals of the "Middle Ages" Inquisition, that tortured, imprisoned, hanged and burned those who differed in opinion from the officers of that Inquisition.

M. H.

LOCAL LECTURES AND MEETINGS.

Meetings of the Spencer-Whitman Center, 2238 Calumet avenue, are held Mondays and Thtursdays of each week. Lectures begin at 8 p. m. Discussions follow the lecture. All invited to participate.

The Chicago Society of Anthropology holds regular meetings Sunday afternoons in Corinthian Hall, seventeenth floor Masonic building. Meetings open at 2:30. All invited.

Chicago Social Science Club meets every Sunday at 8 o'clock p. m. in Hall 913, Masonic Building.

VARIOUS VOICES.

Full name and address of writers in this department can generally be obtained on application to the editor.

We are always glad to receive calls from friends visiting the city. Take the Lake street elevated, stop at Ashland avenue, walk one block east, then one block north. Or take Fulton street electric car west and stop at St. John's place, alighting in front of our house. The Lake street electric and Paulina street cars also pass within a block of our residence.

PAUL ROBIN (Editor "Regeneration"), Paris, France.—Friends and myself beg to send to you one dollar and a few stamps we have left—too small a contribution—for your defense against Comstockian hypocrisy. We send also a few cents to the fund for Voltarine de Cleyre, martyr of madness and stupidity.

A. L. S., Cedar Rapids, Iowa.—I received the sample copy of LUCIFER which you sent me and like it very much. I feel sure there was never anything in your paper that the postal authorities need to concern themselves about. I inclose 20 cents for more copies.

J. E. WITMAN, Hazleton, Pa.—Words fail me when I try to express my indignation at the manner in which the postal authorities are using you, yet better things are hardly to be expected under existing conditions. My protest goes to President Roosevelt today. With best wishes. Enclosed is $5 for books, subscription and defense fund.

S. GELUS, No. Andover, Mass.—Am sorry to learn that the postal inquisitors are continuing their work of selecting what the citizens of the United States can read and what they cannot. I want to receive LUCIFER even though the postal censors do not intend to allow me to do so, and would gladly pay two dollars a year as long as necessary, instead of one, as at present.

D. WEBSTER GROH, Hagerstown, Md.—Because the corrupt politicians who run our government or state abuse their power, of which they already have too much, I heartily oppose such unlimited increase thereof as socialism proposes, by politician ownership (government ownership) of everything, which would indeed make us the veriest

slaves to the politicians that the world ever saw. The more government owns the less there is left for individuals to own, and we would be poor indeed under socialism. "What is everybody's business is nobody's business" is a very true saying and applies equally to property. Soon neither the states nor we would have any property, as no man would care to produce what he could not own or receive an equivalent for. Every man should be responsible for his own acts—his own children—their food, clothing, shelter and education; and to shift his responsibilities in these matters on those who are not responsible therefor is unjust and immoral, and the law is right in so far as it fixes this responsibility, and wrong in so far as it fails to do so. Yours for equal rights.

J. S. STRAKER (Capt.-, Crepping Hall, Wakes' Corner, Essex, England.—I sent ten shillings ($2.40) to you towards the cost of the proposed appeal. As an English lawyer I hope the case will be dealt with suitably, and as a student of some of the subjects most directly affecting the welfare of races and individuals I hope a ruling will be obtained that will be fair to the individual and beneficial to the state.

RYAN WALKER, New York City.—Your letter, forwarded to me from Baltimore, received. I am heartily in sympathy with you, and deplore this Russian tyranny of officials in this country. The censorship of LUCIFER and the suppression of "Mrs. Warren's Profession" here only gives us an idea of what is coming, unless we battle for the rights of all and not of a few. I will send you a contribution next week.

A. J. KRAFT, Grantfork, Ill.—Received your sample copy of LUCIFER and enjoyed reading it very much; and coming to the conclusion that LUCIFER should be sustained, I herewith send you a dollar for one year's subscription. Keep the torch of reason as high as possible, that it may enlighten humanity and brave the storms, and victory is bound to be the outcome. Hoping and wishing that you may live a long and happy life, I remain, Yours truly.

J. W. DAUGHERTY, Hitchcock, S. D.—I enclose $1 to apply on my subscription to LUCIFER. I feel that the principles of law and justice have been violated by the postal authorities that are persecuting you. But they have to make a pretense of earning their salaries. My rights as well as yours are invaded when they stop a paper I have paid for. Fight it to the end. History tells us that the greatest results of martyrs' lives come after their deaths.

MRS. S. H., Beaver Falls, Pa.—Please send me one copy of "Thoughts of a Fool," for enclosed $1. I am very indignant at the treatment you are receiving for standing up and fighting for my downtrodden sex, although I luckily don't happen to be one of the oppressed in the general sense of the word, but I am not blind to the conditions of others less luckily situated. I wish I had the means to express my sympathy in at least a monetary way.

Dr. S. A. WEST, Rock Port, Mo.—My beloved Brother: Your letter of the 3rd has been with me since that time. Yes, I received the medallion in good order. It is splendid work and I have given it a good place in my study. The idea of writing President Roosevelt is, I think, a good one. If ALL would take the hint, it would draw like a magnet! Your word on the manner of approaching the president is good, too. I pat you on the back for thus speaking out boldly. Only good can possibly come out of all this fight!

L. H. ANDERSON, Chicago.—Your favor saying copies of "Hilda's Home" had been sent to addresses sent you received. The absurd objections which the postoffice departments raise would be laughable were it not so serious a matter. I really think the most objectionable feature to them is "Moses Harman" and their inability to crush him. "Right is Might." "Truth is mighty and will prevail." I hope that you can soon reap the fruits of your earnest toil. * * * Enclosed find $ .00, for which you will please send, at your earliest convenience, one copy of "Hilda's Home," in cloth, to each of the following addresses.

MRS. F. M. B. MORSE, Berkeley, Cal.—I believe there are lots of people that believe as you do, but who, for reasons of their own, keep still about it. *(The sentences occupying this space in the first edition of this number were declared by the postal censorship to be unmailable.)* It seems to me that if a letter could be written by some one and sent around in each community where LUCIFER circulates, protesting to President Roosevelt, every one that believed in the paper would sign it. Many persons would sign the letter that would not write. I would gladly do so. Inclosed is $1 to help the cause.

JOE TROUNSON, Healdsburg, Cal.—I subscribe to many papers and am doing what I can along many lines of reform, so you see I am not in a position to do much for any particular cause. I firmly believe, though, that you are at the basic principle on which depends the future weal or woe of the race, and how any sane man or woman can offer such opposition to so rational a theory is more than I can understand. I object to the word *theory*—having used it inadvertently—for it is no more a theory than is the law of gravitation, nor less certain in its general results, though individual cases may diverge from the regular course taken by the majority.

KATE A. UNTHANK, Lawrence, Kas.—I think Comrade Oliver A. Verity and C. L. James, in LUCIFER of November 9, have struck the key note for action. Whether the first suit could be won or not, possibly the second or third might be, and they would have the effect of holding up this hypocritical government as the laughing-stock of the world—not excluding Russia, now that she is granted free speech and press. Such a showing would result in much good. I, for one, would be proud of the honor of assisting to the amount of a few dollars, and more if possible, if the right parties could be prosecuted. Inclosed find $1 for your defense fund and 50 cents for a book. Hoping for and believing in the better outcome for yourself and the cause, I am most sincerely yours for truth and freedom.

GEO. E. LIGHT, St. Louis, Mo.—Please send me: One Thoughts of a Fool," $1; one year's subscription to LUCIFER, $1; one year's subscription to "Truth Seeker" (Bradford, Eng.), $1; one "Creative Life," 25 cents; one "Strike of a Sex," 25 cents; one "Origin of the Family, Private Property and the States," 60 cents; one "Bible Temperance," 40 cents; one "Right Generation," 50 cents. * * * Enclosed please find $5. With best wishes.

[The price of the Bradford Truthseeker is 35 cents per year, monthly—not $1. "Bible Temperance" is 20 cents each, not 40 cents.—M. H.]

W. L. LIGHTBROWN, Washington, D. C.—I have recently seen your paper, LUCIFER, and I want to tell you that it is just what I like and admire. I have always been interested in the subjects you treat of and fully appreciate their value, and I am doing some propaganda work in a small way along those lines. I shall be glad to have your paper, so am enclosing $2 for myself and another whom I persuaded to subscribe for it. I wish I could give you some material help besides in your battle for a free press. I take an advanced position on the subject of marriage and relations of the sexes, and particularly as to the rights of children to be well born. Can you assist me in becoming acquainted with others who hold like views? I feel that we should get together to accomplish the most good.

W. W. M., New Haven, Conn.—I enclose herewith a copy of a letter that I sent to President Roosevelt, and the reply received therefrom. I did my best to make a presentable letter so that he might take notice of it, but do you think for one moment that President Roosevelt ever saw that letter? I don't. I don't believe the politicians ever permitted that letter to reach his sight. You see what the reply says: "That my letter was referred to the Postal Department. Now, isn't that a sensible thing to do? The very department complained of is allowed to make its own investigation. Is it to be supposed for one minute that that department is going to find any of its members guilty? Not by a —— sight. Now the question that one of your correspondents wrote, viz., "What can be done?" continually forces itself into my mind, and I echo, What can be done? *What can be done?* Doesn't it seem awful to think that the sensible class must submit to the injustice heaped upon them by a lot of fanatics? I don't see how you are able to hold out against your persecution; you are a wonder. I feel in my heart an admiration I can't express for those who revolt against the tyranny of their oppressors.

BANSI DHAR, Lucknow, India.—Your latest pamphlet contains much sensible advice. Such a book, however, seems incomplete without a chapter on the limitation of the number of offspring. Perhaps such a discussion is tabooed in the United States. But you do not mention anything even about the practice of "Zugassant's Discovery." Do you consider it objectionable, and hence have not given it a place in your book? I cannot help laughing at the curious pronunciamento of the law as given in LUCIFER, that "any and all discussion of the sex question is obscene and so unmailable." I do not believe that the laws of the United States would be so opposed to the ordinary rules of justice, equity and good conscience as to admit of this interpretation.

[We advertise and sell "Zugassent's Discovery." It is part of the book called "Strike of a Sex," written by Geo. N. Miller. It has had a very wide circulation in this country and in Europe. The statement that "any and all discussion of the sex question is obscene and unmailable" is now denied by the official to whom it was attributed, but the rulings against the six condemned editions of LUCIFER leave one in doubt as to what will be held to be mailable by the postal department and what unmailable.—M. H.]

Albina L. Washburn, "Coöperative Exchange," San Diego, Calif.—If I have time will write a short letter to President Roosevelt, but would rather write a loving letter to your post office man at Chicago, if I knew his specific address. . . . . You are always asking for advice—a thing *I* cannot do, for no one knows *for us!* I have such confidence in your own judgment *if you would only use* it fearlessly—as the inner voice—that I cannot but regret your want of courage in that respect. . . . . After all you are depending on *dollars* to right and justify your course. *They never will!* . . . . If you were Mr. Jones, I would say: "Mr. Jones, please go on with what you were doing—teaching the people *how to live.* Quit scolding about what the other fellows are doing. Have too much pride, dignity and self-respect to *intimate* that it makes any difference to you. Be optimistic, humorous if you can, but never seriously admit that LUCIFER'S cause or work can be hurt by mud-slinging, nor even by robbery. . . . . Mr. Jones, you might even give LUCIFER and yourself a cheerful vacation for

awhile, until the matter "blows over." Concentrate on something else as foreign to it as possible; then come back with calm nerves and better health."

Mr. Jones might tell me contemptuously: "You do not know it all yet," which would be as "thrue a wurrud as iver was shpoke."

As to a letter to Mr. Roosevelt, while I think he is developing rapidly to be an independent people's president, how about the "one man power" we have always decried? And where is the consistency, dignity or justice in addressing him personally in behalf of a publication which in a recent issue says editorially, under the head, "Don't Indict the Corporations": "When Theodore Roosevelt demands that the corporation be indicted and that the officials go free, is it not because he knows that he himself is at the head of the most criminal of all the corporations, the United States government itself?—and that if its officials were indicted for their crimes against the common citizen he himself would have to meet criminal charges more numerous than any other man, perhaps, now living on the American continent?"

[The only comment I have to make upon the kindly meant criticism of our old-time friend and helper is that if Theodore Roosevelt is developing rapidly to be an independent *people's* president he will welcome all candidly expressed opinions, whether favorable or unfavorable to himself. Only cowardly despots are offended by plainly worded criticisms. If he is not a despot he will at once investigate the many charges made against his subordinates in the post office and other departments of the national government, and if he finds these charges to be true he will lose no time in correcting the abuses and in doing what he can to recompense the innocent sufferers from these abuses. M. H.]

A SUGGESTION.

Publisher of LUCIFER: Now that the "ball is open" in way of letter writing to the president, let me suggest that subscribers write to their representatives in congress, asking for the repeal or modification of what is known as the Comstock law. Let Mr. Harman give the proper name and number of this law, so it can be referred to by writers understandingly. Yours for truth and freedom. SUBSCRIBER.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

Communism and Conscience—Pentecost and Paradox—Crimes and Criminals.

BY EDWIN C. WALKER.

Equal Liberty, Equal Rights—not equal liberty to invade, but equal right not to be invaded; not equal liberty to interrupt a meeting, but equal right to listen without being interrupted; not equal liberty to steal, but equal right not to be robbed; not equal liberty to wantonly kill, but equal right to be secure against murder.

The Law of Liberty, definitions by Clifford and Stephen. Fashionable to Deny Natural Rights, Spencer on the Scope of Evolution, Rights of Children, Increasing Complexity of Life, Interdependence of Individual and Society, Close Connection with the Past, The Boycott, Its Relation to Liberty, The Paradox is Uncertain, The "Right to Invade," Liberty and Responsibility, "Free Will," Necessity and Defense, The People the Source of Invasion, Conscience—What It Is, What It Does; Undiscriminating Rejection of Morality, Changing Names and Institutions, "Wine of Omar Khayyam," The All-Is-Good Discovery, Whitman a Reformer, Defensive Association, "Right" and "Might," The Secular Principle, Vicarious Atonement, We Are in Nature, We are Natural, Property Rights, What is Evolution?

CRIMES AND CRIMINALS: Suggestive, Not Dogmatic. What We Are Not Considering. Two Stages in the Study. How Should We Act Toward the Anti-Social? Gain in the Direction of Humanity. Six Important Rules to Guide Social Action. Relative Values of Deterrents. Capital Punishment. "Labor," and Labor in Prisons. The Principle of Restitution. Reason Guides from the Old to the New. Tradition and Reason.

Price, 25 cents.

MOSES HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago, Ill.

PROUDHON AND HIS "BANK OF THE PEOPLE."
BY CHARLES A. DANA.

This is a defense of the great French anarchist, showing the evils of a specie currency, and that interest on capital can and ought to be abolished by a system of Free and Mutual Banking. A series of newspaper articles written by the after-time editor of *The New York Sun*, he having been a Brook Farm experimenter in early life. Price, 10 cents.

MOSES HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago, Ill.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Bas Relief Medallions of Moses Harman.

Bas relief medallions of the bust of Moses Harman, size 9 by 14 inches (oval), the work of La Verne F. Wheeler, a well-known Chicago artist, can be had at the following prices: Plain white, $1; old ivory, $1.50; plain bronze, $2; Etruscan bronze, $2.50. Thirty-five cents additional for boxing and shipping. The proceeds of sales, after deducting bare cost, are to be devoted to the defense of LUCIFER'S editor. Send orders to La Verne F. Wheeler, 3323 Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

The advertisements occupying this space in the first edition of this number were declared by the postal censorship to be unmailable.

1053

If these figures correspond with the number printed on the wrapper of your Lucifer, your subscription expires with this number.

If a copy of Lucifer fails to reach you, please order by number or date.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

A VOLUME OF POEMS

BY

WILLIAM FRANCIS BARNARD,

Associate Editor of "Tomorrow."

"THE MOODS OF LIFE."

A collection of verse which will be sure to attract attention among those who are looking for new poetry. The author has been a contributor to American magazines for several years, and is well known as a poet of modernity with a remarkable gift of imaginative expression.

12mo Cloth; Gilt title; 160 pages.

$1.00 POSTPAID. READY NOV. 1ST.

THE ROOKS PRESS.

THE ROOKERY. CHICAGO, ILL.

THOUGHTS OF A FOOL,

A book which deals with all the questions of the day: Sex, Popular Morality, "Success," "The Man to Be," "Life's Message," "Symbols and Tags," "The Universal Secret," etc., etc., in a manner boldly original.

ONE HUNDRED OF OUR SUBSCRIBERS

can have a chance to read a copy, for the publishers have offered 100 copies to OUR SUBSCRIBERS at the SPECIAL RATE OF $1.00.

(IT'S A $1.50 BOOK.)

It's been widely read, much reviewed and has created a storm of criticism and praise.

Don't send for it, if you don't want strong stuff, original thought, bold views that may shock your prejudices.

Don't send for it if you have prejudices!

AND THERE ARE ONLY 100 COPIES ANYWAY AT THIS PRICE, $1.00.

We'll return your money if the 100 are sold when it reaches us.

What the Young Need to Know.

A PRIMER OF SEX RATIONALISM.

BY E. C. WALKER.

SUGGESTIONS OF CONTENTS: Is There Necessity for This Knowledge? Analagous Dangers and Safeguards. Unwisdom of Custom-Sanctioned Ignorance. Teachers Better if of Opposite Sex. Divisions of the Subject. Definitions of Sex. Evolution of Sex; Differentiation. Reproduction Less and Less Perilous. Inestimable Value of Use. Joy Is Positive, Upbuilding. The Deciding Majority of Two. The Tendency to Multi-Selection. A Serious Error in Exchange. Effects of Meat, Stimulants and Narcotics. Reproduction and Social Happiness. Not so Many Children, but Better Ones. Legal Intrusion Has a Limit. Voluntary Complexity, and Health. Comparative Exemption of the Jews. The Upward March. Cure and Irremediable Punishments. Origin of the Shame of Sex. Derived from Other-World Mania. "The Son of God" and Sex. Faithful Followers of Jesus. Relation of Past Asceticism to Existing Type. Mental Slaves Are Not Investigators. Romauld and Clarimonde. Sex Manifestation Below Our Race. Sex Inspiration in Human Endeavor. What is Immodesty? Primitive and Present Day Savage Customs in Dress. Civilized Customs and Costumes. What We Affirm on This Subject. Bathing and Dress. Asceticism and Honesty in Art. Arguments of the Puritan. Judge Phillips and Mr. Moody. To Take the Purity of Nudity in Art for Granted. Asceticism and Literature. Foolishness of Hiding Social Wrongs. Take off the Taboo.

Price, 15 cents.

MOSES HARMAN, 500 Fulton St., Chicago, Ill.

FOR PEOPLE WHO THINK.

TOMORROW MAGAZINE.

A monthly Hand-Book of the Changing Order. Devoted to Educational, Political and Social Progress. A rational and progressive publication which deals with *causes* instead of effects in its treatment of the vital questions of the day. One dollar a year. Ten cents a copy. Published at the Spencer Whitman Center, 2238 Calumet avenue, Chicago, Ill.

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL CARDS.

OTTO WETTSTEIN,
THE LIBERAL MAIL-ORDER JEWELER.

Now permanent at No. 110 N. Kensington av., La Grange, Cook Co., Ill. Can save you 10 to 20 per cent on Watches, Diamonds or anything in the Jeweler's Line. Write me and receive prices and my great little tract, "Theism in the Crucible," free.

J. H. GREER, M. D.,
52 DEARBORN ST., CHICAGO.

Office Hours—9 a. m. to 6 p. m.; Wednesdays and Saturdays, 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.; Sundays, 9 a. m. to 12 m. Telephone Randolph 61.

DR. OGILVIE A. RICE,
DENTIST.
1556 MILWAUKEE AVE., COR. WESTERN, CHICAGO.
Telephone West 141.

PHILIP G. PEABODY,
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW.
15 COURT SQUARE, ROOM 61.
BOSTON, MASS.